

## **Joint FBC Committee Meeting Notes**

### **June 10, 2015**

Committee Members: A. Montroll, E. Lee, C. Mason, M. Tracy and J. Shannon (phone)

Staff: D. White (Planning), and K. Sturtevant (City Attorney's Office)

**Topic:** Sec. 14.7 Administration and Procedures – see pages 109-115

A. Montroll noted that this was still a committee of 6 members and PC Chair Yves Bradley had been asked to appoint another commissioner.

E. Lee asked if the Committee should be reviewing/approving meeting notes/minutes. Staff will provide notes and this can be done in the beginning of the meeting agenda.

A. Montroll asked about getting a clean version with all changes made so far. Staff expects to have something in the next couple of weeks.

#### **Public Forum:**

E. Morrow stressed that the draft still includes many barriers to net-zero design. There is an incentive for applicants to use a fast track which may make them less interested/supportive of alternative paths and need for relief. Also that no architects on staff or guaranteed on the DRB to review. Should be a requirement for both.

D. Gayer asked what version of the FBC we are currently working on. Answer is April 3.

B. Goblik asked how this is related to planBTV and shouldn't it address the Climate Action Plan, stormwater management and GPI. Staff explained that his process directly implement recommendation of those policy documents as applicable.

#### **Application Submission** (see p 109)

D. White noted that staff is developing language requiring the use of a survey as the basis for any site plan, as well as the use of licensed professionals were required by state law (surveyors, architects and landscape architects).

#### **Project Review** (see p 111)

Committee consensus that pre-application neighborhood input is important. Should remain a requirement for larger projects (following current Major Impact threshold or similar).

Pre-application review by staff is also important and should also remain a requirement for larger projects (see above).

M. Tracy & E. Lee asked about the suggestion of hiring a City Architect to review projects – would be valuable towards ensuring energy efficiency, durable materials and design. D. White responded that it was really a staffing and resource question more than one related to the regulations. With the necessary resources provided in the Department's budget, a design professional like an Architect or Urban Designer would be a great skill set to add either as a consultant on retainer or FTE staff person. Current staff already has expertise in this field and more would be very helpful. The more important question however has to do with exactly what is being reviewed and under what standards? Without clear standards, the review (by staff or DRB) is increasingly arbitrary and unpredictable. More detail in the regulations regarding energy efficiency beyond the current requirements and durable materials are great things to add, but they can come later as well. The proposed FBC will be a living document and should continue to evolve over time – it doesn't need to address every issue right now.

Discretionary review by DRB will continue to include Conditional Uses, Major Impact Projects, Variances and Appeals based on the current review standards in the CDO and statute. Also to be added should be any Civic Spaces and Buildings and discretionary building height above the base height (e.g. 65' in FD6). Committee would like to discuss the review standards at the next meeting.

Non-Conformities (see p 111, and p 5-14 thru 5-18 of the CDO)

Committee members questioned the adequacy of the "Substantial Modification" definition that would trigger the requirement for full conformity – it needs to consider more than just the added value. What about size as well? Also the "Substantial Modification" needs to be relative to the work being done – is it the site, building, frontage or sign? Changes to one shouldn't automatically require a change to all. Finally, the DRB should retain some role in the review of changes to non-conformities – this needs to be further clarified between FBC and Sec. 5.3.5 of the CDO

Public Forum #2:

B. McGrew said that there is a lot of difference between 5 units of housing and a 65' building.

D. Gayer said that building materials, glazing and energy efficiency are very important and should be included and considered early in the process.

E. Morrow noted that the role of a City Architect should be to add value to all projects, and the additional energy efficiency should require a variance.